

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Atisa Hayes,)	Civil Action No.: 4:22-cv-02252-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Clarios, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”)¹ of United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, who recommends granting the alternative relief sought in Defendant Clarios, LLC’s Motion for Sanctions and Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Prosecute. *See* ECF Nos. 49 & 56. As such, the Magistrate Judge recommends dismissing this action with prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with the court’s orders. *See* ECF No. 56.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Neither party has filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.² In

¹ The Magistrate Judge issued the R & R in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.).

² Objections were due by November 27, 2023. *See* ECF Nos 56 & 58.

the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note))).

Having found no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's R & R [ECF No. 56], **GRANTS** the alternative relief requested in Defendant's [ECF No. 49] motion, and **DISMISSES** this action *with prejudice*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
November 30, 2023

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
Chief United States District Judge